



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Appropriateness of Colonoscopy Indications in Multiple Digestive Endoscopy Centers in Abidjan: A Multicenter Study Using EPAGE II Criteria”

Submitted: 06 July 2026

Accepted: 28 August 2026

Published: 30 September 2026

Corresponding Author: Yaogo Abdoulatif

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n27p109

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Patrick Kwame Feglo

Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement to the authors and editors of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published, or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Patrick Feglo	
University, Country: Ghana	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/8/26	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/8/26
Manuscript Title: Appropriateness of Colonoscopy Indications in Multiple Digestive Endoscopy Centers in Abidjan: A Multicenter Study Using EPAGE II Criteria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 24—46.07.2026	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: X	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-----------	---

1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	5
The title is clear and concise for this article	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>The abstract is clear, presents objectives, methods and results well presented.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The grammar was appropriate and presentation was adequate	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study method was clear and adequate for the study</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>There are presentation errors: After indicating that 448 colonoscopies were performed; It is not clear what is being excluded to obtain 419. Maybe the word 'performed' was not appropriate. Sentences like these need revision where frequencies and percentages need be placed together. Eg in 128 patients (30.5%), chronic constipation in 80 patients (19.1%), and chronic diarrhea in 36 patients (8.6%) is not appropriate. T should read "in 128 (30.5%) patients, chronic constipation in 80 (19.1%) patients and chronic diarrhea in 36(8.6%) patients". Many of such statements are in the article and needed to be corrected.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Targeted educational interventions it should read 'Targeted training interventions'	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Schussel� Filliettaz in-text citation need to be revised. Ndjitoyap Ndam et al., 2025 needs revision in-text. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
------------------------------	--

Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In Table 1 there were p-values, which are clear. It is difficult to tell what was being compared. They should be removed, it will not affect anything. There are presentation errors: After indicating that 448 colonoscopies were performed; It is not clear what is being excluded to obtain 419. Maybe the word 'performed' was not appropriate. Sentences like these need revision where frequencies and percentages need be placed together. Eg in 128 patients (30.5%), chronic constipation in 80 patients (19.1%), and chronic diarrhea in 36 patients (8.6%) is not appropriate. It should read "in 128 (30.5%) patients, chronic constipation in 80 (19.1%) patients and chronic diarrhea in 36(8.6%) patients". Many of such statements are in the article and needed to be corrected.

Targeted educational interventions it should read 'Targeted **training** interventions'

Schussel   Filliettaz in-text citation need to be revised.

Ndjitoyp Ndam et al., 2025 needs revision in-text.